

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 1, 2003.

**I. Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 2, 11-18, 27-32, 39 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Knutsson et al., U.S. Pub. 2002/0006788 (“Knutsson”). Applicant traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 1, Knutsson does not disclose at least a search section which searches for wireless LAN access hot spot data based on user criteria for wireless LAN locations in or near places not currently in a reception range of the wireless LAN access section where a user desires to relocate to access a wireless LAN, as recited in claim 1.

Knutsson discloses positioning a plurality of wireless access points in at least a known relative relationship to one another; and each of the plurality of wireless access points for establishing communications with corresponding proximate ones of the wireless devices; mapping selected ones of the plurality of wireless access points with corresponding inventory located proximate to each of the selected ones of the plurality of wireless access points; correlating each access to the multi-point wireless access network from a corresponding wireless device with the corresponding inventory; and providing at least one of location dependent

information and location dependent services to the corresponding wireless device responsive to said correlating act (Figs. 1-3 and paras. 0012-0015). In other words, Knutsson stores and provides information relating to goods and services available in the vicinity of known selected wireless hot spots of a wireless LAN to which a user is connected, but not information that allows a user to locate a wireless hot spot for a wireless LAN in a desired area not currently in a reception range of the wireless LAN access section.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Knutsson for at least the reasons set forth above. Since independent claim 1 is patentable over Knutsson, dependent claims 11-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 17, 31 and 39 contain features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, therefore claims 17, 31 and 39 are patentable for similar reasons. Also, since claims 27-30 depend from claim 17 and these claims have been rejected over the same reference, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

With regard to claim 2, Knutsson fails to disclose at least a receiving section which receives wireless LAN access hot spot data from said server, wherein said wireless LAN access hot spot data indicates wireless LAN locations in or near places not currently in a reception range of the wireless LAN access section where a user desires to relocate to access a wireless LAN.

As illustrated by Figs. 6 and 7, and stated in paragraphs 40 and 41, the server of Knutsson provides environment directories mapped to known hot spot locations of a LAN the user is connected to. The wireless access devices receive information from the server based on environments that map the locations of predetermined access points, for example, airports,

hotels, malls, etc., with the associated inventory within each environment. However, the wireless access devices of Knutsson do not receive search information necessary to locate wireless LAN access hot spots other than the predetermined access points of the connected LAN.

Therefore, claim 2 is patentable over Knutsson for at least the reasons set forth above. Claims 18, 32 and 40 contain features that are similar to the features recited in claim 2, therefore claims 18, 32 and 40 are patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 3, 5, 9, 10, 19, 21, 25, 26, 33, 35, 41 and 43 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knutsson in view of Odakura et al., U.S. 6,922,634 ("Odakura"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Knutsson and Odakura does not disclose or suggest all the elements recited in the claim. As noted above for claim 1 from which claim 3 depends, Knutsson fails to disclose or suggest at least a search section which searches for wireless LAN access hotspot data based on user criteria for wireless LAN locations in or near places not currently in a reception range of the wireless LAN access section where a user desires to relocate to access a wireless LAN. Odakura does not cure these deficiencies of Knutsson.

Further, Odakura does not disclose or suggest at least wherein the wireless LAN access hotspot criteria include a telephone number in an area where a user desires wireless LAN access hotspot location data, as recited in claim 3. Odakura prompts the user for a destination address or telephone number, and searches for an optimum route to the destination (Fig. 13 and col. 11, ll. 29-45). In other words, Odakura inputs an address or telephone number to search for

directions to a specific location, not to search for wireless LAN access hotspot location data in an area where a user desires to access a wireless LAN.

Even if one of ordinary skill in the art had been motivated to combine the references, the combination still would not disclose or suggest all the elements of claim 3. Therefore, claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Knutsson in view of Odakura. Claims 5, 9 and 10, which also depend from independent claim 1, contain features that are similar to the features recited in claim 3, therefore claims 5, 9 and 10 are patentable for similar reasons.

Claims 19, 21, 25, 26, 33, 35, 41 and 43 depend from one of the patentable independent claims 17, 31 and 39, and contain features that are similar to the features recited in claims 3, 5, 9 and 10. Therefore, claims 19, 21, 25, 26, 33, 35, 41 and 43 are patentable for similar reasons.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 4, 6-8, 20, 22-24, 34, 36-38, 42, and 44-46 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Since each of these claims depends from one of independent claims 1, 17, 31 and 39, and since these independent claims are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above, dependent claims 4, 6-8, 20, 22-24, 34, 36-38, 42, and 44-46 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

## **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, claims 1-46, which are all the claims pending in the application, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a


Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Application No. 10/724,153

Attorney docket No. Q78678

personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Howard L. Bernstein  
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 22, 2006